

**Agency:** 477 Department of Fish and Wildlife  
**Decision Package Code/Title:** XI Eliminate PS Contaminant Samples  
**Budget Period:** 2011-13  
**Budget Level:** PL - Performance Level

### Recommendation Summary Text:

This secondary 5% reduction option to the WDFW's Puget Sound toxic contaminant program will completely eliminate the program. Currently, WDFW samples key indicator species English Sole and Puget Sound herring for the presence of numerous contaminants to inform and guide policy and decision makers about the presence of toxic contaminants in the Puget Sound food web and the general health of Puget Sound fishes. This reduction would result in resource managers, decision makers, and policy makers not being able to make informed decisions about toxic contaminants and the overall health of Puget Sound. This program and the resulting data is part of the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda.

### Fiscal Detail

<b>Operating Expenditures</b>	<b><u>FY 2012</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(205,579)	(205,580)	(411,159)
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>(205,579)</b>	<b>(205,580)</b>	<b>(411,159)</b>
<b>Staffing</b>	<b><u>FY 2012</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013</u></b>	<b><u>Annual Average</u></b>
FTEs	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0

### Package Description:

As part of the Puget Sound Action Agenda, WDFW samples two key indicator species in Puget Sound (Pacific Herring and English Sole) for toxic contaminants. Assuming the first 5% reduction has been implemented, this work is completed every four years and the analyzed data informs policy and decision makers about the toxic trends from pollution in the Puget Sound and the overall health of the ecosystem. This work is a GMAP indicator.

Economic pressures in Washington continue, reducing the revenue the state receives to fund state services. Projected General Fund-State (GF-S) revenues upon which the 2011-13 state budget was developed are not likely to meet expectations. In response, the Governor has requested a 5-10 percent reduction in the 2011-13 GF-S budget.

WDFW is proposing to eliminate the sampling for toxic contaminants in Puget Sound. This reduction package includes the elimination of one Research Scientist 2 position, one Fish and Wildlife Biologist 2 position, and staff support dollars.

This reduction will completely eliminate the Agency's ability to detect and respond to toxic contaminants in Puget Sound. The loss of two key staff positions will eliminate our technical capacity to inform and communicate with policy and decision makers about the presence and trends of toxic contaminants, analyze data, report on the findings, and guide Puget Sound recovery efforts by 2020. This work is part of the Puget Sound Action Agenda and a GMAP indicator.

The implementation schedule for this reduction option is to be determined.

Name and Phone Number of Subject Matter Expert:  
Craig Burley, Fish Management Division Manager (360) 902-2784

## **Narrative Justification and Impact Statement**

### ***What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?***

The sampling for toxic contaminants in Puget Sound would be eliminated.

All legislative districts connected to Puget Sound will be impacted by this reduction option.

## **Performance Measure Detail**

**Activity: A042      Native Fish Recovery**

**Incremental Changes**

No measures submitted for package

### ***Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?***

This reduction option impacts the WDFW 2011-17 Strategic Plan Goal 1, Objective B: Increase protection and restoration of ecosystem functions.

### ***Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?***

This reduction option lessens the Department's contribution towards the recovery of Puget Sound by 2020.

### ***Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?***

This Activity ranked 23 of 148 activities in the 2011-13 POG result area "Protect Natural Resources and Cultural and Recreational Opportunities".

### ***What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?***

This work is part of the Puget Sound Action Agenda and a GMAP indicator.

### ***What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?***

The Department first identified opportunities for savings or fund shifts and partnerships and looked for reductions that would have the least impact toward accomplishing our core functions. While the department can no longer preserve its primary functions without relief from the current economic climate and funding limitations, the recommendations seek to minimize impacts to core functions, while at the same time emphasizing our conservation mission.

An alternative to eliminating this work is to fund this activity through the State Toxics Control Account (STCA), which would require additional STCA expenditure authority. Monitoring Toxic levels in the environment is an allowable use of STCA funds under current law.

### ***What are the consequences of not funding this package?***

This reduction will eliminate information on toxic trends from pollution in Puget Sound and any assistance from WDFW in guiding recovery efforts. This reduction will eliminate technical information on toxic contaminants, our ability to detect and respond to toxic contaminants, and technical guidance on recovering Puget Sound by 2020. The state will be less able to detect improvements in the health of the Sound, and whether current strategies are working. This work is part of the Puget Sound Action Agenda and a GMAP indicator.

***What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?***

None.

***What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?***

None.

***Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions***

Research Scientist 2

Salary = \$6,000/mo. x 12 months = \$72,000

Benefits = \$1,900/mo. x 12 months = \$22,800

Total Annual Cost = \$94,800

Fish and Wildlife Biologist 2

Salary = \$4,000/mo. x 12 months = \$48,000

Benefits = \$1,600/mo. x 12 months = \$19,200

Total Annual Cost = \$67,200

Object E Expenditures:

Staff support costs = \$5,500/year/FTE x 2.0 FTE = \$11,000/year

\$65,159 included in object E of this package represents the infrastructure and support costs associated with this program reduction. Recent administrative cuts have been deeper than program cuts, and administrative services reflect skeletal staffing levels. Future administrative cuts will therefore be proportionate to program reductions, and administrative functions will generally comply with state and federal laws.

***Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?***

This budget reduction would be on-going.

<b><u>Object Detail</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2012</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
A Salaries And Wages	(120,000)	(120,000)	(240,000)
B Employee Benefits	(42,000)	(42,000)	(84,000)
E Goods And Services	(43,579)	(43,580)	(87,159)
<b>Total Objects</b>	<b>(205,579)</b>	<b>(205,580)</b>	<b>(411,159)</b>